

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY
P.O. BOX 602
TOWN HALL ANNEX
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568
(508) 696-4270
Fax (508) 696-7341
www.tisburyma.gov

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: January 19, 2022

TIME: 5:00 PM

ATTENDANCE: Alexander, Bellante Holand, Doble, Munafo and Robinson

PLACE: Due to ongoing efforts to prevent spread of Covid-19 this meeting will be held remotely via Zoom platform. The Public can attend and participate in the meeting by the following method:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/98000880479> Meeting ID: 980 0088 0479

One tap mobile

+16468769923,,98000880479# US (New York)

MINUTES: As referred in the January 5, 2022 Meeting Agenda

APPOINTMENTS:

5:00 PM Water Resource Committee: Discussion on a Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan (CWMP)
Attendance: Michael Loberg (WRC Member), Nancy Gilfoy (WRC Member), and Benjamin Robinson (WRC Member)
Robert Rafferty (Env. Partners); Mark White (Env. Partners); Teresa Kruszewski, Kate Roosa (Env. Partners); and John Best; Melinda Loberg (5:51 PM)

B. Robinson, Chairman of the Water Resource Committee called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM. He acknowledged the members of the Committee present for the discussions, their consultants and the one member of the general public present at the meeting. He noted for the record that members of the Planning Board were provided with a draft copy of the committee's Draft Assessment and draft set of the committee's minutes dated 01/16/22. B. Robinson introduced R. Rafferty, the Committee's consultant who was going to explain the needs assessment, the Committee's progress and their next steps.

R. Rafferty explained that the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan was intended to chart the town's future wastewater issues, which was in large part driven by the nitrogen

loading into the coastal abatement (Lagoon Pond and Lake Tashmoo) which was studied as part of the Massachusetts Estuary Study by MassDPH. He explained that nitrogen loading into the abatement did not support the eel grass that supported the ecosystems (fisheries). Current studies indicate that we are importing an excessive amount of nitrogen into the town's waterbodies. The source being on-site disposal works septic systems and storm water run-off, both of which they could manage. The CWMP, hereinafter is investigating how they can reverse the situation to reduce the amount of nitrogen they are contributing to their watersheds. It consisted of four parts:

- 1) Needs Assessment – investigating and collating all existing documentation (land use, demographics, etc.) into a repository, including future projections for development as it pertained to wastewater generation. He explained that the Master Plan project was very important to the assessment and infrastructure
- 2) Alternatives – investigating alternative advanced treatments systems, storm water controls that were feasible
- 3) Draft Recommended Plan – building community consensus (public meetings) and applying for permits from the state for an approval from MassDEP before they continue onto their next phase.

R. Rafferty indicated that the committee was interested in understanding the future conditions that could help them learn more about the future projections for growth and was interested in soliciting the high- and low-end percentages for growth that they could narrow down as they moved through the phases of their study.

B. Robinson asked R. Rafferty for the state required future needs analysis for this project. R. Rafferty replied that they did not have a prescribed method for projecting growth. MassDEP however believed that the only permanent solution was sewerage. R. Rafferty felt that it rarely made sense to rely on one method alone. Still they had to include sewerage to address the nitrogen loading. B. Robinson inquired if zoning and land use was another standard they had to employ. R. Rafferty replied in the affirmative, noting that the Mass Estuaries Study at the MV Commission included build-out projections and concluded that the current zoning regulations allowed 70% additional growth in the Tashmoo Watershed. He explained that while they could follow the projections, sewerage, wastewater planning and on-site systems have to respond to the chart laid out by the Master Plan. In absence of a Master Plan, they could work with a plan based on anticipated growth projections, but the plan has to be adaptable.

D. Bellante Holland inquired if she understood correctly the Committee was going to be presenting a baseline with the existing zoning and a central sewer system. In the past couple of years, she has noticed an increase in multi-unit and dwelling developments and restaurants with larger seating capacities in the B1 and B2 Districts. It appeared that the latter district had been targeted as having the potential for even denser developments, with restaurants being the economic driver. She asked R. Rafferty if he could explain the kind of feedback the committee was soliciting when an increase in the sewer system becomes untenable or when the resources to maintain the system are not available.

M. Loberg, Chairman of the Board of Health explained that the town had to remove 32% of the “controllable” nitrogen that was currently going into Lake Tashmoo to protect the ecosystem and eel grass. Eighty percent of the 32% “controllable” nitrogen was generated by septic systems. If they managed to reduce Forty-two percent of the nitrogen load that emanated from the septic systems, they would be able to comply with MassDEP’s mandate. MassDEP has advised them that if they could accomplish the 32% reduction with the advanced systems, they did not have to include a sewer backup system. R. Rafferty clarified that while they did not have to include the sewer as a backup system, it had to be part of the adaptability plan of the CWMP.

M. Loberg noted that if they were going to use the nitrogen loading as ‘the reason’ for sewerage, D. Bellante Holand’s question was very important. They would have to consider the capital (infrastructure) and operating costs (and maintenance) to remove a pound of nitrogen for both sewer and the advanced technologies. He mentioned that the Cape Cod Commission had completed two studies and calculated the costs for a number of advanced technologies and the town’s current sewer plant. The latter of which does not remove any nitrogen from their watersheds.

R. Rafferty noted that the current sewer plant was developed to address the bacteria pollution in the harbor. He wanted to reiterate that the sewer plant had to be included in the CWMP but did not have to be implemented if they found a more cost effective solution, even if that meant 100% on-site systems. He advised the Board that they were very interested in the existing development patterns, and locations that can accommodate denser developments (developed and vacant lots) within the watersheds, because they were obligated to offset 100% of all “controllable” nitrogen. M. Loberg advised the Planning Board that the Board of Health had recently adopted denitrification regulations requiring all new construction had to be zero nitrogen.

B. Robinson informed the Planning Board that the CWMP provided the town access to two funding sources (zero percent revolving loan and participation in a Cape & Islands organization that funded nitrogen removal). He added that the existing plant is nearing its end of useful life within the next five to six years and will continue to require period upgrades. He thought it important for the Planning Board to understand that the Committee needed their assistance and felt they could help by looking into affordable housing, where they wanted to encourage affordable housing, particularly in the BI District. He thought they had to look at the type of housing they wanted to have in the BI District and its impact of sewerage, He noted that the Housing Bank is looking to repurpose existing properties for affordable housing and other strategies that had the potential of increasing the densities of the residential districts, which could also have an impact on the study.

D. Bellante Holand indicated that the Planning Board has been looking at developing area plans for their commercial and business districts, particularly the BII District where they’ve discussed mixed used development and small commercial hubs (with top of shop housing) surrounded by residential areas to maintain a small village feel. She thought these types of developments would compact density in smaller pockets that could impact their plans.

She also noted that there appeared to be some overlap in the study that could be coordinated by the consultants to their mutual benefit. B. Robinson did not think there was an overlap, He felt there were areas in their studies where they would benefit from a coordinated effort to get the feedback they needed.

D. Bellante Holand understood that homeowners were solely responsible for the IA systems, and town residents connected to the sewer system were going to have to pay for the connection and use. B. Robinson added that there will be a shared cost for the infrastructure and its maintenance.

M. Loberg clarified that the only individuals bearing the cost for either system were the town residents living in the watersheds. The Board of Health was of the opinion that they could meet the state's mandate if they could also retrofit the existing systems to address the nitrogen loading at a very low cost. He also mentioned that they were not forced to create new construction if it contradicted the Master Plan. R. Rafferty noted that they could also combine houses into a common IA system or cluster treatment facility. They were all under consideration. He also wanted to advise the Board that they had many options or programs by which to fund whatever option they decided on to make it equitable.

K. Roosa (Environmental Partners) confirmed that there was a new school of thought around sewer funding as it pertained to hybrid utility systems, which would be narrowed down in the upcoming analyses.

C. Alexander inquired about the bacteria the first plant was designed to address and asked R. Rafferty about the source of the bacteria and if it was the same. It's collection system (sampling) gives him the impression that it is not as bad as it used to be, but because of the shell fishing and boat mooring's contribution to the bacteria count it warranted further monitoring.

J. Best indicated that the bacteria monitoring was secondary to the BI District's desire for expansion, public bathroom access, etc. because the lots could not accommodate on-site systems. The existing plant fell short to include all of the residential lots in the area that were in the zone of contribution to the harbor. B. Robinson noted that it was almost impossible to install an on-site sewer treatment system on a lot in the BI District because they did not have the land area. J. Best thought it was true of the lots in the sewer district, but not the surrounding residential lots.

C. Alexander asked M. Loberg to explain how the town was proposing to offset any future increase in the nitrogen load that going into the watersheds with the ongoing new constructions. M. Loberg replied that the Board of Health recently approve an advanced septic system for an affordable housing development such as Keuhn's Way that managed 6000 gpd. The system removed 90% of the nitrogen load generated by the housing development, so that a fifty (50) bedroom development generates nitrogen produced by a five (5) bedroom single family dwelling. Island Housing Trust was repurposing other homes in the watershed to create multi-unit dwellings and they were retrofitting existing septic

systems to reduce the nitrogen loading by 90% as well. B. Robinson reported that the MV Commission was making applicants do the same.

D. Bellante Holand inquired about the Planning Board's role for making sure that mitigation was accounted for in the larger scale developments they're reviewing.

M. Loberg indicated that the Board of Health had adopted a 'no-net' new nitrogen policy, so that property owners understood that they owned their nitrogen and were responsible for removing it. He has noticed that the regulations inadvertently promoted growth, denser use of properties which lead to more nitrogen in the watersheds. But if they continue to encourage and wherever possible mandate the IA systems, he believed they will leave the estuaries in better shape for future generations.

C. Alexander did not think existing neighborhoods would agree to a cluster system. She felt they were going to be much more successful in requiring these systems for new developments. It was a concept the Planning Board should think about for new developments.

J. Best thought about D. Bellante Holand's question about the Planning Board's role in the reduction of nitrogen in the larger scale developments and thought about the Norton property at the head of the lagoon that was recently cleared. He was concerned about the nitrogen that was released from the site and thought the Planning Board could amend the zoning regulations to limit the amount of clearing.

C. Doble understood that they were looking at alternatives relative to the projected growth. She read the draft needs assessment and recalled that the Committee was looking at data from the Planning Board that was a bit dated. She noted that they've been looking at different areas of development in town and development at different levels of density to generate preliminary data, but did not have the information they were going to need until they began working on the Master Plan. She wanted to know how the Planning Board could contribute to the data that was meaningful to the Committee.

R. Rafferty screen shared a Table 30: Summary of Growth/Build-out Projections under section 5.47 entitled Summary of Build Out Estimates and advised the Board that they could assist the Committee by agreeing on how they move forward. He understood the town was looking at the BI and BII Districts for potential growth, but they were moving towards the next phase of the project where they had to price things to compare the alternatives (size of pipes, number of pipes, number of IA systems, etc.) for the two areas the town had indicated had the potential for growth. Based on the data from table they calculated a 24% - 38% growth in the Lake Tashmoo Watershed and a 14% - 34% growth rate in the Lagoon Pond Watershed. He wanted to check in periodically with the Planning Board's consultants to make sure the Committee was still on track. R. Rafferty added that he also wanted to meet with the Board to discuss the alternatives. N. Gilfoy left the meeting at 6:02 PM.

B. Robinson thought it was important for the Planning Board to set some time aside at one of their meetings to discuss the needs assessment and to provide their feedback to the Water

Resource Committee. D. Bellante Holand recommended March 2, 2022. C. Doble asked B. Robinson to provide the materials they were commenting on beforehand so that they could come prepared for a productive discussion.

C. Alexander asked the Water Resource Committee Members if they were looking at other pollutants and chemicals in addition to nitrogen removal. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative and thought that it may be that they were going to add technologies to the sewer plant or on-site systems to remove some of the chemicals. C. Alexander felt they had to include the additional pollutants because development brought more than nitrogen.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson moved to adjourn the Water Resource Committee's meeting at 6:10 PM.

6:15 PM Public Hearing (Cont.): Main Street Medicinals LLC, Mechanics Way
Attendance: Katherine O'Shea, Matthew Skelly (Fuss & O'Neill), Ross
Seavey, Michelle Kelly

The continuation of the public hearing commenced in due form at 6:15 PM. D. Bellante Holand read the hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the board members present for the discussion, acknowledging R. Seavey, building commission as one of the public officials in attendance.

D. Bellante Holand informed the Board that they had received an email from N. Eisendrath dated 01/12/2022 in which the applicant reported that his consultants were in the process of integrating the mitigation measures into their plan to schedule an appointment with the LUPC. He recommended continuing tonight's discussions until 03/02/2022 at 6:00 PM.

D. Bellante Holand entertained a motion from the board to honor the applicant's request for a continuation on March 2, 2022 at 6:00 PM. C. Doble so moved. C. Alexander seconded the motion. D. Bellante Holand roll called the Board: Robinson, Doble, Alexander and Bellante Holand voted in favor of the motion.

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 6:18 PM

6:18 PM Stephen and Michelle Foster Kelly re: Short Term Rentals on a Special Way
Attendance: Ross Seavey, Melinda Loberg

M. Kelly would have liked to participate in the Board's discussions on 12/03/2021 regarding the impact of the special way regulations on guesthouses but was provided with the video recording of the meeting. She was happy with some of the Board's findings but was looking for further clarification about their decision on short term rentals in the last part of the discussion.

D. Bellante Holand recalled that the discussion was an interpretation of the special ways regulation's relative to the addition of a guesthouse on property within the special way overlay district. There was additional discussion regarding the use of a guesthouse, and it

was noted that the guesthouse was a permitted use by the Zoning Board of Appeals, so that it would require their review and approval. She did not understand what it was that M. Kelly wanted the Board to address. M. Kelly replied that it pertained to the portion of the discussion where the Board disagreed on the business aspect of the short-term rental which was confusing to her. She inquired if the Board could clarify if the rental of the house and/or short rental of the guesthouse on a special way would require a special permit from the Planning Board.

B. Robinson clarified that the Board did not decide on the subject because it was discussed as a hypothetical. In his opinion, when the Town began to tax the short-term rentals, they essentially blessed the use in their residential districts. As long as the activity from the short-term rental does not impact the 20 ft buffer from the centerline of the special way road, it was no different from the residential use of the property, or any other residential property in a residential district. He did not believe it constituted a commercial use of the property. If one ran an excavation company from a residential property, then they would look further into the impact from the commercial activity.

C. Doble noted that the discussion also included the access, so that as long as the existing driveway was being used to access the additional structure, they would not need to apply for a special permit from the Planning Board. The additional curb cut on a special way triggered the special permit requirement.

M. Kelly thanked the Board, because she thought she understood the Board to say that short term rentals were considered a business, which was not allowed. So it appeared to her that the Board was not saying this. It touched on her concern that the regulation could either restrict or add a deed restriction that would have impacted their plans, which could have changed the value of their property. B. Robinson reiterated that the special way regulation did not impact the short-term rental of a structure. S. Kelly mentioned that it was the clarification they were hoping to obtain from the Planning Board, noting that he thought he heard from the recorded session that a short-term rental would require a special permit. He mentioned that it was possible that their plans may not materialize, but with the recent surge in construction activity around him, he felt others would be looking to the Planning Board for information and clarifications.

C. Doble referred to the Planning Board minutes M. Kelly referred to and understood how the text could have been misunderstood and confusing. B. Robinson reiterated that short term rentals did not convert a residence into a commercial property. If they ran a home business from the property, that it was an entirely different matter. C. Doble thought the discussion emphasized the need to list and identify the uses that would require a special permit from the Planning Board or a permit from the Board of Appeals.

D. Bellante Holand thought C. Doble raised a good point and thought prospective homebuyers should be made aware if their property lies in the special way overlay district, and what that meant i.e., potential considerations. She felt applicants had to understand that s. 09.03.03 requires the Board to look at the use in terms of "... results in direct vehicular traffic across the way", and that s.09.05.03.01 asks the Board to address the" nature and

extent of pre-existing vehicular use of a special way”. The latter lead her to interpret the regulation to state that the Board will need to understand “the existing use patterns when they review applications”. She also noted that the existing regulations do not allow businesses in guesthouses.

E. Miller in an email dated 01/16/22 to the Board stating:

It appears to me reading the regulations of Special Ways, 09.03, that the applicable condition here is 09.03, 06. Additional Consideration to grant the applicant the ability to build a guest house using the current driveway access to both the existing main house and the proposed guest house.

The additional condition of not allowing seasonal rentals is based on the purpose of allowing accessory buildings on the property; to provide year-round housing. That condition was included to prevent seasonal use which exacerbates the year-round housing affordable housing situation.

B. Robinson inquired about the special situation E. Miller mentioned in her email. D. Bellante Holand wasn't sure but assumed that it pertained to zoning. Board staff thought it may pertain to the restrictions in s. 04.03.08

C. Alexander referred the Board to the goals presented by the regulation in section 09.03.01; The goal of the regulation is to preserve the character of the old ways and retain the abutting landscape. Additionally, the regulation is to protect and prevent the injurious effects that would accompany development of the Ways as a primary vehicular route.

She then referred to s. 09.03.05 entitled Special ways relating to vehicular use which appeared to keep vehicular use to a minimum and s. 09.03.06 which implies that an applicant may have to secure a special permit for the increase in vehicular use in addition to the permit from the Board of Appeals.

B. Robinson referred to s. 09.03.03 (Any residential, recreational, agricultural or open space use permitted in the respective zoning districts, subject to existing regulations and restrictions, provided that the development does not result in direct vehicular access to the Special Way.) and felt that it included guesthouses.

C. Alexander agreed that the regulation was difficult, but that it clearly state that they did not want to deprive the landowner a reasonable use of their property. She hoped the Board addressed their questions and concerns. M. Kelly was replied in the affirmative, indicating that they felt comfortable to follow through on their plans.

S. Kelly and M. Kelly departed the meeting at 6:40 PM.

7:02 PM Deliberations: Special Permit Amendment by Jim Feiner, AP 24A19
Attendance: Jim Feiner, applicant; Ross Seavey;

The deliberations were duly opened at 7:02 PM and members of the board present at the discussions were acknowledged. Board staff screen shared the draft denial noting that she had corrected a typo in the section entitled Determination

Board members were advised that the applicant's agent called the office earlier to inquire if the language would have to be revised if they opted to let the natural wood material for the exterior grey naturally, because the main house was not painted. P. Harris assumed the color specified in the condition referred to the trim, until she was asked if the applicant would have to paint the guesthouse if they decided to paint the main house down the road. She asked the Board for their comments and recommendations.

J. Feiner understood the Board wanted the buildings to look alike, but how alike did they want them to look. B. Robinson clarified that the Board did not find the red paint complimentary.

D. Bellante Holand asked board staff if she found an issue with the text in Finding No. 3. She replied in the negative. R. Seavey thought the language was very clear. The applicant should make the structure match the main house or at least blend in with the rest of the neighborhood. The T1-11 bond board was not the typical Vineyard Haven vernacular. He did not believe they were looking for an identical match, but it was an example he could use.

There being no further comment from the Board, D. Bellante Holand entertained a motion, C. Alexander moved to approved the written decision as presented. C. Doble seconded the motion. D. Bellante Holand roll called the Board: Robinson, Doble, Alexander and Bellante Holand voted in favor of the motion. m/s/c 4/0/0

B. Robinson moved to close the deliberations at 7:10 PM. C. Alexander seconded the motion, and the motion carried: 4/0/0 The deliberations were closed.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

A. NEW BUSINESS

1. Town Report

D. Bellante Holand reported that she had received comments from E. Miller and C. Doble and was interested in soliciting additional comments or edits from the remaining board members by the end of the week to submit the final document to town hall by 1/21/22.

C. Alexander requested a copy of the draft document. D. Bellante Holand offered to download the document in Google Docs and sent the board an email with the word document.

2. Master Plan RFQ

A. Contract

C. Doble met with J. Grande and J. Barrett via zoom to discuss the new budget with a request for additional funding to create Phase IV to include an implementation program and complete the final Master Plan. J. Barrett indicated that it was the best she could do to include the area plans and meet the requirements of the Master Plan.

C. Doble explained that J. Barret relocated some of the tasks into Phase IV in order to put the extra funds into vision planning and the area plans. Phase II was heavily combined with public outreach. J. Grande did not have any issues with the latest development and budget and was going to move forward to develop the contract with J. Barrett. She noted for the record that she had sent the Board a copy of J. Grande's Draft.

C. Doble reached out to J. Barrett for additional information about the implementation plan and had requested examples to confirm that they were on the same page. She reported that she received four samples and sent them to Board to review. She conveyed to the board members that they had to manage the project closely to make sure that they are getting what they want. As she looked at the contract, she thought the Planning Board had to be at the Kick-Off meeting to be able to articulate to the planning team what they were looking for. She thought it important to know that J. Barrett confirmed that she would not be able to provide them the development guidelines for the area plans they had requested.

D. Bellante Holand inquired if they were referenced in the implementation plan. C. Doble replied in the affirmative but believed it may also change the cost. It was therefore important for them to be actively involved in the process to make sure that the final product meets their needs. Board members were asked to look at the draft implementation plan J. Barrett developed to make sure it was what they wanted.

C. Doble further noted that J. Grande was recommending against asking the town for additional funds this year without having started the process and a report on their progress. D. Bellante Holand informed C. Doble that they had funds in their budget for the area plans, so that it was no longer on the table.

Board members were once again asked for their feedback on the implementation plan samples and contract. C. Doble wanted to make sure that the implementation plan was what they wanted before she is entering into the next round of negotiations with J. Barrett. D. Bellante Holand asked C. Doble to download the documents into the shared Master Plan Folder in Google Docs.

C. Alexander inquired if the \$189,000.00 paid up to Phase III. She was concerned if they still had to negotiate for the final plan. C. Doble explained that it had gone up to 195,000.00, not including Phase IV. Phase IV had to be completed to get the final plan. She offered to send the Board J. Barrett's most recent funding break down. B. Robinson noted that could use the funds in their budget or through a town warrant.

D. Bellante Holand thought they also had to make sure they balance the use of the budgetary line item for professional services because E. Miller has been recommending it use to hire D. Doyle.

B. Robinson reviewed the implementation program and did not favor the long laundry list J. Barrett provided. He wanted the consultant to condense the list and target the areas of greater importance. C. Doble concurred. She really liked the team but wanted to see a different approach to this project. B. Robinson agreed, and thought they had to articulate it.

D. Bellante Holand reminded the Board that they have a work session scheduled on February 15, 2022, and thought they could discuss the steering committee's role, and that of the Board as they oversaw the project's management.

B. Steering Committee

D. Bellante Holand informed the Board that they've sent the press release to the local paper and reached out to several boards for their assist in posting the press release and application. The Tisbury Library offered to email the information to their patrons. She asked Board members how they wanted to contact the list of individuals they recommended as viable applicants for the committee. C. Alexander had reached out to a few individuals that she had recommended.

D. Bellante Holand thought they could take a personal approach or send out a group email. B. Robinson preferred the personal approach, so that the Board did not come across as pre-endorsing individuals. C. Doble agreed with B. Robinson and thought they should move forward on making personal contacts. C. Alexander recommended an asterisk beside the names they've contacted.

C. Doble offered to use the Vision Planning email list and to contact J. Custer to see if he would send the press release and application to the school's email recipients.

C. Webpage

D. Bellante Holand hoped board members had the opportunity to look at the information P. Harris posted on the website and screen shared the information that had been posted (landing page, link to the free form, the description and application).

C. Doble asked if they could upload a word document that folks could download in addition to the pdf file. Board staff offered to upload the file if it was possible.

D. Master Plan Project Manager

D. Bellante Holand offered to draft a preliminary job description for the position and to upload the draft on Google Docs. B. Robinson noted that the person had to have basic computer literacy and some familiarity with the town's software.

2. Upcoming TPB Calendar: Public Hearings, Appointments & Discussions

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. Committee Reports (Updates only)

A. Vision Forum

B. Land Bank Advisory Committee

C. Tisbury Housing Committee

D. Community Preservation Committee

E. Water Resource Committee

F. Sewer Advisory Committee – C. Alexander reported that the committee recently meet after a long hiatus. Most of the discussions centered around the outdated rules and regulations except for the two applicants (Black Dog, Prime Marina) that were listed on the agenda.

G. Site Plan Review Board

H. Open Space and Recreation Committee

I. Energy Committee

J. All Island Planning Board

K. Climate Committee

L. Tisbury Waterways Committee

2. Uses requiring a Special Permit

~~A.~~ Main Street Medicinals – E. Miller & D. Bellante

~~B.~~ MV Shipyard – C. Doble

~~C.~~ Tisbury Marine Terminal – B. Robinson

~~D.~~ 4 Beach Road LLC (Educomp) - C. Alexander

~~E.~~ Hinckleys – E. Miller & B. Robinson

~~F.~~ Patrick Lyons – 70 seat Restaurant (Bldg E) – C. Doble & P. Munafo

~~G.~~ Greg Carroll, 5 McClellan Way – B. Robinson

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Martha's Vineyard Commission

A. Extended Meeting Schedule

B. LUPC Meeting

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 7:46 P.M.

(m/s/c 4/0/0)

Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Dawn Bellante-Holand
Chairman